UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,240	03/30/2004	Erik de la Iglesia	006897.P001	8139

97298 7590 08/04/2010		

Patent Capital Group
6119 McCommas Blvd
Dallas, TX 75214

EXAMINER
SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

thomasframe@patcapgroup.com
patbradford@patcapgroup.com
roseanne.cisneros@patcapgroup.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 May 2010</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Amendment received on 05/24/2010 has been entered into record. Claims 1, 12 and 17 are amended. Claims 1-20 are currently pending.

2.   Applicant's submission filed on 11/25/2009 was entered. No claim was amended.

3.   Amendment received on 04/30/2009 was entered into record. Claims 1, 12 and 17 were amended.

4.   Applicant's submission filed on 02/09/2009 was entered. The amendment to the specification to change the title of application was reviewed and accepted. Claims 1, 12 and 17 were amended.

5.   Amendment received on 08/20/2008 has been entered into record. Claims 1, 12-13 and 17-20 are amended.

Priority

6.   This application has claimed priority from provisional application 60528643 filed on 12/10/2003. The filing date is 03/30/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter
> sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have
> been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art
> to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley et al. (US

7277957 B2), hereinafter referred as Rowley and further in view of Saulpaugh et al. (US

7072967 B1), hereinafter referred as Saulpaugh.

      a.   Rowley shows (claim 1) an apparatus (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) comprising: a network

interface module to connect the apparatus to a network (column 3, lines 28-33;

Ethernet card as a network tap device); a packet capture module to intercept packets

being transmitted on the network (column 3, lines 33-35: a packet capture engine); an

object assembly module to reconstruct flows representing objects being transmitted

on the network from the intercepted packets (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are

sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list until the last

packet has been retrieved; column 4, lines 29-34: data from the selected packets may

be reconstructed into data files and script files used to display web pages and other

content; column 6, lines 59-65: local cache holding word processing documents, PDF

files, audio files and video files), the packets associated with a document (column 4,

lines 29-34: packets reconstructed into data and script files for web pages and other

contents), wherein objects are captured based on a capture rule that specifies the

objects, and wherein a determination is made as to whether to discard or to store the objects (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the subsequent reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based on a set of criteria); an object classification module to determine a type of content of the objects (column 4, lines 63-65: determine the type of packets; column 6, lines 6-11: packet indicates a script file type to be displayed as page, e.g. HTML, Java Script and Active Server Pages; multi-packet recompilation module set similar directories for local cache of files) and to reconstruct the objects from flows (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved; column 6, lines 59-65: local cache holding word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video files); an object store module to store the objects (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved), wherein a location for storing the objects is determined based at least in part on the type of content for each of the objects (column 4, lines 29-41: packets are extracted and used to create storing cache files and directory structures for reconstructing network communication session; column 6, lines 38-48: directory structure based on image file type; column 6, lines 49-65: directory structure for graphics files, text files, audio files and video files); and a user interface to enable a user to search objects stored in the object store module (column 7, line 66-column 8, line 1: web browser or display program capable display text, graphic and other visual information on a computer monitor). Rowley does not explicitly show (claim 1) the

document includes the objects; wherein the objects are searched based a query, which includes search criteria used to identify selected objects that match the search criteria. Rowley does show (claim 1) however using browser to search and identify objects based upon search criteria seems to be known to one skill in the art.

b. Saulpaugh shows reconstructing objects from XML data stream (column 82, lines 28-52); search based on search criteria (column 33, line 55-column 34, line 3); database query based upon name or strings (column 41, line 60-column 42, lines 10); query results cache (column 48, lines 33-52); and search tag may contain optional set of search criteria (column 64, line 10-column 65, line 9) in an analogous art for the purpose of efficient construction of message endpoints.

c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Rowley's functions of reconstructing network communications with Saulpaugh's functions of reconstructing objects from XML data stream and message query based on name or string.

d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to data selection or query based on name or string as per Saulpaugh's teaching in support the display of data collected and reconstructed as per Rowley (column 1, lines 54-65) and Saulpaugh (column 82, lines 28-52)'s teaching.

e. Regarding claim 2, Rowley shows wherein the object assembly module comprises a reassembler to assemble the intercepted packets into flows (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list

until the last packet has been retrieved; column 6, lines 59-65: local cache holding

word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video files).

f.   Regarding claim 3, Rowley shows wherein the object assembly module further

comprises a protocol demultiplexer to sort the assembled flows by protocol (column

4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the

protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved ; column 6, lines 59-65:

local cache holding word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video

files).

g.   Regarding claim 4, Rowley shows wherein the object assembly module further

comprises a protocol classifier to extract the objects from the sorted assembled flows

(column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to

the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved ; column 6, lines 59-65:

local cache holding word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video

files).

h.   Regarding claim 5, Rowley shows wherein the object classification module

determines whether objects are stored in the object store or discarded based on one or

more capture rules (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the subsequent

reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based

on a set of criteria).

i.   Regarding claim 6, Rowley shows wherein the capture rules are user-configurable

through the user interface (column 1, line 66-column 2, line 9: selecting a portion of

the packets captured by a sniffer during a giving time interval; column 3, lines 43-47:

selecting captured data during a specified time interval; claim 1: capture packets

based on a set of criteria).

j. Regarding claim 7, Rowley shows wherein the object classification module

determines a location that each object is stored in the object store based on the type of

content of each object (column 4, lines 29-41: packets are extracted and used to create

storing cache files and directory structures for reconstructing network communication

session; column 6, lines 38-48: directory structure based on image file type; column

6, lines 49-65: directory structure for graphics files, text files, audio files and video

files).

k. Regarding claim 8, Saulpaugh shows wherein the object classification module

determines the type of content of each object using a signature of each object (column

82, lines 28-52: an object signature may be included to identify the object's class).

l. Regarding claim 9, Rowley shows wherein the user interface comprises a graphical

user interface (column 7, line 66-column 8, line 1: web browser or display program

capable display text, graphic and other visual information on a computer monitor).

Together Rowley and Saulpaugh disclosed all limitations of claims 1-9. Claims 1-9 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8.   Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley,

Saulpaugh and further in view of Barnett et al. (US 7290048 B1), hereinafter referred as Barnett.

a. Rowley shows claim 1 as above. Neither Rowley nor Saulpaugh shows (claim 10)

wherein the object store module comprises a content store to store the objects and a

tag store to index the objects stored in the object store. However, Rowley does show

identifying protocol and collecting packets into a protocol sorted list; selecting, reconstructing and displaying data information, e.g. web pages, from a protocol session.

b. Barnett shows (claim 10) wherein the object store module comprises a content store to store the objects and a tag store to index the objects stored in the object store (column 10, lines 52-61: tags and other columns support transaction recognition, pointer to original sources of data for traceability; column 22, lines 18-37: tags interpreted are time, data, file name, line numbers, graph object types, source, destination and tool tip information) in an analogous art for the purpose of data collection, data analysis, and model generation for the performance analysis of enterprise applications.

c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Rowley's functions of reconstructing network communications with Saulpaugh's functions of message query based on name or string and Barnett's functions of using tags in support of performance analysis.

d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to tag and identify data as per Barnett's teaching in support the data collection and reconstruct as per Rowley (column 1, lines 54-65), Saulpaugh (column 82, lines 28-52) and Barnett (column 7, lines 35-45)'s teaching.

e. Regarding claim 11, Barnett shows wherein the content store comprises a canonical storage, and the tag store comprises a database (column 12, lines 4-12: canonical form for abstract module, sources supply lines information form text file, binary file

or database; column 13, lines 26-48: data consists of network traces consisting of

arrays mutated into hash tables to be addresses by column header vs. row and column

locations).

Together Rowley, Saulpaugh and Barnett disclosed all limitations of claims 10-11. Claims

10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9.   Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley in

view of Saulpaugh and Barnett.

      a.   Rowley shows (claim 12) an method comprising: intercepting data being transmitted

on a network (column 3, lines 33-35: a packet capture engine); reconstructing flows

of objects being transmitted on the network from the intercepted data (column 4, lines

9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol

sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved; column 4, lines 29-34: data from

the selected packets may be reconstructed into data files and script files used to

display web pages and other content; column 6, lines 59-65: local cache holding word

processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video files); classifying the

reconstructed objects by content type (column 4, lines 63-65: determine the type of

packets; column 6, lines 6-11: packet indicates a script file type to be displayed as

page, e.g. HTML, Java Script and Active Server Pages)), the data associated with a

document (column 4, lines 29-34: packets reconstructed into data and script files for

web pages and other contents), wherein objects are captured based on a capture rule

that specifies the objects, and wherein a determination is made as to whether to

discard or to store the objects (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the

subsequent reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based on a set of criteria); and storing the classified objects (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved). Rowley does not show (claim 12) the document includes the objects; creating a tag to describe each reconstructed object; storing tags; indexing the stored objects to enable searching of the stored objects via the tags, wherein the content type of the objects is used in the indexing and wherein the objects are searched based on a query, which includes search criteria used to identify selected objects that match the search criteria. However, Rowley does show (column 4, lines 29-41) packets being extracted and used to create storing cache files and directory structures for reconstructing network communication session; identifying protocol and collecting packets into a protocol sorted list as per IP address and port number to categorize packets (column 4, lines 42-65); (column 6, lines 38-4): directory structure based on image file type; selecting, reconstructing and displaying data information, e.g. web pages, from a protocol session, including the directory and file structures (column 7, lines 37-51).

b. Barnett shows (claim 12) creating a tag to describe each reconstructed object; storing tags; storing tags; indexing the stored objects to enable searching of the stored objects via the tags (column 10, lines 52-61: tags and other columns support transaction recognition, pointer to original sources of data for traceability; column 22, lines 18-37: tags interpreted are time, data, file name, line numbers, graph object types, source, destination and tool tip information) in an analogous art for the purpose of

data collection, data analysis, and model generation for the performance analysis of

enterprise applications.

c. Saulpaugh shows reconstructing objects from XML data stream (column 82, lines 28-

52); search based on search criteria (column 33, line 55-column 34, line 3); database

query based upon name or strings (column 41, line 60-column 42, lines 10); query

results cache (column 48, lines 33-52); and search tag may contain optional set of

search criteria (column 64, line 10-column 65, line 9) in an analogous art for the

purpose of efficient construction of message endpoints.

d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Rowley's functions of reconstructing network

communications with Saulpaugh's functions of reconstructing objects from XML

data stream and message query based on name or string and Barnett's functions of

using tags in support of performance analysis.

e. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to tag and identify data as per Barnett's teaching in

support the data collection and reconstruct as per Rowley (column 1, lines 54-65),

Saulpaugh (column 82, lines 28-52) and Barnett (column 7, lines 35-45)'s teaching.

f. Regarding claim 13, Rowley shows wherein reconstructing the objects comprises:

sorting the intercepted data into packets; and sorting the assembled flows by protocol

(column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to

the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved ; column 6, lines 59-65:

local cache holding word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video files).

g. Regarding claim 14, Rowley shows further comprising determining whether each object is to be stored based on a set of one or more capture rules (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the subsequent reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based on a set of criteria).

h. Regarding claim 15, Saulpaugh shows further comprising receiving a query over the stored objects (column 27, lines 10-29: query for a message response).

i. Regarding claim 16, Saulpaugh shows further comprising searching the indexed objects, and retrieving objects matching the query (column 41, line 60-column 42, lines 10: database query based upon name or strings; column 48, lines 33-52: query results cache);

j. Regarding claim 17, Rowley shows an machine-readable storage medium having stored thereon data representing instructions (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: intercepting data being transmitted on a network (column 3, lines 33-35: a packet capture engine); reconstructing objects being transmitted on the network from the intercepted data (column 4, lines 29-34: data from the selected packets may be reconstructed into data files and script files used to display web pages and other content); classifying the reconstructed objects by content type (column 4, lines 63-65: determine the type of packets; column 6, lines 6-11: packet indicates a script file type to be displayed as page, e.g. HTML, Java Script and Active Server Pages), the data associated with a

document (column 4, lines 29-34: packets reconstructed into data and script files for web pages and other contents) identifying characteristic of the document (column 5, lines 28-37: indicates a file with characteristics), wherein objects are captured based on a capture rule that specifies the objects, and wherein a determination is made as to whether to discard or to store the objects (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the subsequent reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based on a set of criteria); storing the classified objects (column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved). Rowley also shows (column 4, lines 29-41) packets are extracted and used to create storing cache files and directory structures for reconstructing network communication session; (column 6, lines 38-48) directory structure based on image file type; and (column 6, lines 49-65) directory structure for graphics files, text files, audio files and video files.

k. Saulpaugh shows reconstructing objects from XML data stream (column 82, lines 28-52); search based on search criteria (column 33, line 55-column 34, line 3); database query based upon name or strings (column 41, line 60-column 42, lines 10); query results cache (column 48, lines 33-52); and search tag may contain optional set of search criteria (column 64, line 10-column 65, line 9). Barnett shows creating a tag to describe each reconstructed object; storing tags; storing tags; indexing the stored objects to enable searching of the stored objects via the tags, wherein the content type of the objects is used in the indexing (column 10, lines 52-61: tags and other columns support transaction recognition, pointer to original sources of data for traceability;

column 22, lines 18-37: tags interpreted are time, data, file name, line numbers, graph

object types, source, destination and tool tip information). Claim 17 is of substantially

same scope as claim 12. Thus the reasoning and motivation to combine of Rowley,

Saulpaugh and Bameet as applied to claim 12 apply to claim 17.

l. Regarding claim 18, Rowley shows wherein reconstructing the objects comprises:

sorting the intercepted data into packets; and sorting the assembled flows by protocol

(column 4, lines 9-12: packets are sequentially read, decoded, checked and added to

the protocol sorted list until the last packet has been retrieved ; column 6, lines 59-65:

local cache holding word processing documents, PDF files, audio files and video

files).

m. Regarding claim 19, Rowley shows wherein the instructions further cause the

processor to determine whether each object is to be stored based on a set of one or

more capture rules (column 3, lines 62-67: packet not needed for the subsequent

reconstruction of the network communication session; claim 1: capture packets based

on a set of criteria).

n. Regarding claim 20, Saulpaugh shows wherein the instructions further cause the

processor to receive a query over the stored objects, search the indexed objects in

response to the query, and retrieve objects matching the query (column 27, lines 10-

29: query for a message response; column 41, line 60-column 42, lines 10: database

query based upon name or strings; column 48, lines 33-52: query results cache).

Together Rowley, Saulpaugh and Barnett disclosed all limitations of claims 12-20. Claims

12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed on 05/24/2010 have been fully considered, but they are not

persuasive.

   a. Applicant has argued the limitation of "the packets associated with a document that

       includes the objects, wherein the document is captured based on a capture rule that

       specifies the objects, and wherein a determination is made as to whether to discard or

       to store the objects of the document" (see 3rd paragraph on page 8 through 2nd

       paragraph on page 9 of current Amendment). This is similar to an argument in page 9

       of Amendment received on 11/25/2009 and 3rd paragraph on page 8 through last

       paragraph on page 9 of a previous amendment received on 10/20/09. An Advisory

       Action was issued on 11/09/2009 in response to the argument as per Amendment

       received on 10/20/09,

   b. Applicant did not amend claim set. Applicant has repeated a similar argument as per

       3rd paragraph on page 8 through last paragraph on page 9 of a previous amendment

       received on 10/20/09 (see last paragraph on page 8 through last paragraph on page 9

       of current amendment). An Advisory Action was issued on 11/09/2009 in response to

       the argument as per previous amendment. A further response on the arguments is

       noted in item 'b' of Response to Arguments in Office Action mailed on 02/23/2010.

       Examiner has reviewed the limitation with respect to the claimed invention as whole

       and in light of applicant's original specification and claim set. Examiner has reviewed

       the applied prior arts, particularly Rowley. Rowley has stated capturing network

       packets based on a predetermined set of criteria in its claims 1, 6 and 12-13. Rowley

has disclosed also selecting a portion of packets captured by a sniffer during a given

time interval (column 1, line 61 through column 2, line 8) and the process of

capturing network packets is known in the art and commonly available software

capture engines include the Sniffer, Lanalyzer, EtherPeek and Ethereal as described

in an applicant's IDS item Etherreal User's Guide" (received on 08/20/2008). Thus

examiner did conclude that the ability to identify the contents to be captured is well

known and disclosed by Rowley and Saulpaugh as applied to reconstruct objects from

XML data stream per Saulpaugh's teaching and are also disclosed as a filter function

specified in Chapter 3 with specific filer fields definitions for various known

protocols in Appendix A of "Etherreal User's Guide".

c. Applicant has further amended independent claims with the limitation of "wherein a
    location for storing the objects is determined based at least in part on the type of
    content for each of the objects" and argued that the applied prior does not have the
    limitation. Examine has reviewed claim rejections as per Office Action mailed
    02/23/2010 with respect to the amended limitation. Examiner has searched and found
    the Rowley has disclosed (column 4, lines 29-41) packets are extracted and used to
    create storing cache files and directory structures for reconstructing network
    communication session and (column 6, lines 38-48) a directory structure based on file
    type (content type) of images.

d. Claim rejections are updated to reflect these findings.

Conclusion

11.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy

as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end

of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the statu9s of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Peling A Shaw/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444